

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 2011

1. CONVENE: 7:05 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Zuppan

3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board Members Ibsen, Kohlstrand and Zuppan.
Absent: Board member Lynch.

4. MINUTES:

Minutes from the Regular meeting of November 8, 2010
Continued-Board requested more detail 4-0-1

Minutes from the Regular meeting of January 10, 2011 (Pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:
None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Report

6-A Future Agendas

Staff presented an overview of upcoming planning project.

6-B Zoning Administrator Report

Meeting of 1-18-11 Canceled

Oral Report

None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-A **“Going Forward Community Planning Strategy for Alameda Point”**

The Planning Board will hold a public hearing to discuss Land Uses and Building Types at Alameda Point.

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, gave a background on the Alameda Point Community Planning over the past 6 months and where the City hopes to be in the next 18-24 months. He reported that in 1993 the Navy announced that it was leaving Alameda. The Navy and the City began a community led effort, the 1996 Reuse Plan. He stated that although the document is general it is a very good planning document containing a good description of the communities' goals and aspirations for Alameda Point. The document was completed and adopted in 1996 at which time the City and community fully expected the Navy would have the property cleaned of all hazardous materials and conveyed to the City by the year 2000. In the late 1990's it was decided to move to the next step to adopt a Master Plan and bring on a Master Developer with experience doing this scale of project. The Master Developer would in turn fund all the necessary studies and environmental review and work with the City to get a plan completed and ultimately adopted by the City Council. The first Master Developer was the Alameda Point Community Partners (APCP) worked with City staff until 2003 at which time they asked the City of Alameda to help them financially. The City agreed and put up \$3 million dollars, but took the lead on the planning efforts and from 2003 to 2006 the City funded a planning effort, infrastructure planning and negotiations with the Navy using funds received from the leases at Alameda Point.

In 2006 APCP notified the City that they would no longer be able to go forward with the project. The City then did another Request for Proposals (RFP) for developers and selected SunCal to pick up the project where it was left off and carry it through to entitlement. SunCal very quickly decided they wanted to do a different plan and go to the voters with their initiative. The initiative did not pass and in July 2010 the City terminated the agreement with SunCal. Throughout both of these efforts the City and the Master Developers have been maintaining a joint pro forma which is essentially a balance sheet estimate looking at all of the costs related to the project and all of the potential revenues from the project. The Navy is also using a pro forma to determine the value of the property.

He reported that in September 2010, City staff initiated a planning and community engagement strategy for "going forward" at Alameda Point. The purpose and intent of the "going forward" community engagement strategy is to identify and describe a community supported, financially feasible development concept for Alameda Point. The development concept will serve as the basis for a land use and entitlement plan and conveyance agreement with the United States Navy (Navy) for Alameda Point.

To implement the community engagement strategy, staff prepared the Community Planning Workbook and designed a series of community forums to engage the community in the process of creating a development concept for Alameda Point. The workbook and the forums are designed to inform and facilitate a community discussion around a number of critically important development questions for Alameda Point. These questions are designed to highlight and focus community discussion on the trade-offs that may be necessary to achieve financial feasibility and fiscal neutrality. The topics highlighted in community workbook include:

1. Land Use – What is the appropriate mix of recreational, cultural, educational, housing, service and employment uses at Alameda Point?

2. Building Types and Neighborhood Character -- What should new buildings and neighborhoods in Alameda Point look like?
3. Parks and Open Space – How should parks and open space be designed to improve the lives of all Alameda residents?
4. Historic Character, Preservation and Adaptive Reuse -- How should we honor and preserve the history of the former Naval Air Station?
5. Transportation and Access – How should people travel to and from Alameda Point?
6. Community Benefits – Which community benefits are the most important?

The City held three community workshops in the fall of 2010. The content and materials presented at the three workshops located at three different locations throughout the City (i.e., East, Central and West Alameda) was identical. This format allowed residents, business owners, and other interested stakeholders from different neighborhoods to provide ideas and feedback on lessons learned and suggest new concepts for Alameda Point. The forums occurred on:

- **November 9, 2010** – East Alameda - Bay Farm Island -- Grand Pavilion
- **November 18, 2010** – Central Alameda - Mastick Senior Center
- **December 8, 2010** – West Alameda – The O’Club

The forums were well attended (approximate 70-100 participants at each forum) and discussions were animated. There is also an online interactive workbook. Staff will also be holding an Alameda Point Tenant Forum on February 8, 2011. The results of the forums will be summarized and made available to the public in March 2011.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked how many workbooks have been completed so far.

Mr. Thomas did not have an accurate count but said he had two boxes full of the hard copy workbooks completed and had not yet received a tally from the online participants.

Mr. Thomas reported that during the months of January and February 2011, City staff is planning to shift the focus of the community engagement process from “community forums” to the City’s Boards and Commissions. Staff is requesting that the relevant Boards and Commissions with primary responsibility for planning, transportation, economic development, parks and open space, and historic preservation participate in the process at a regularly scheduled meeting.

In March staff will publish a going-forward summary of the Fall Forums, the on-line workbook results, the Board and Commission input, and the result of the Alameda Point Tenants Forum. Through the “Going Forward” Summary, staff will create a consolidated summary of “lessons learned” and recommendations for preparing a vision for Alameda Point. Staff is hoping to have the synthesis complete in time to present the summary to the

ARRA at their March 2, 2011 meeting.

Based upon the 15 years of planning efforts that have been completed to date, the General Plan Amendment that was approved in 2003, and the most recent direction provided by the Alameda community during the going-forward process, staff will present for public discussion three or four alternative development concepts and potentially a preferred development concept for initial public review and discussion in April. By July, staff would like to transmit the revised development concept and alternatives to the City's and Navy's environmental consultants in order to commence the environmental review process. The National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) is the process that the Navy must do prior to the conveyance of the land and the City of Alameda must do the California Environmental Act process before adopting a final plan.

He reported that there is a lot of agreement about certain pieces of the plan but still major differences of opinion regarding some of the critical issues such as the amount of development at Alameda Point, the traffic it will produce, and how the traffic will be handled and there are different ways to address these issues in alternative scenarios. He stressed that it is very important that over the next few years the City needs to try and build community consensus around a single plan. A lot of public meetings and public education will be necessary. The project pro forma will be made public so that members of community will be able to see the cost of items they are requesting such as keeping historic buildings. The process is going to need to have trade-offs and there are things that have to be dealt with such as the sea level change, the infrastructure, and recreational services.

He reported that the Alameda community is in full agreement that the Alameda Point plan should be a sustainable plan. The Alameda community is not in full agreement on what a "sustainable plan" must include or exclude, but all seem to agree that:

- The plan must prepare for sea level rise.
- Adaptive reuse of existing building is an excellent sustainability strategy, but not all agree that all buildings should be saved, especially if a building is not financially feasible to retain, or removal of the building makes room for a beneficial, job generating use.
- Shifting travel modes from automobiles to transit and other alternatives is an excellent strategy for sustainability, but there is disagreement on whether it can be done effectively.
- Mixed-use development is a sustainable land use pattern, but there is disagreement on how much housing is necessary in the mix to be "truly sustainable".
- Solar farms, wind turbines, and other forms of on-site energy generation are all strongly supported, provided that there is not an impact on endangered species.

He stated that the City believes that the best approach is to try and entitle the property itself and then go out for a master developer or the City may also decide to do the project in phases. The concern is that the City will not have the money to complete the process to entitlement, at which time the City could look at having a master developer but at least the process will be further along than it is now and there will be less risk for the developer. He

mentioned that the Navy has been cleaning the land during this entire time and expect to have most of the property clean enough to transfer by 2013, by 2018, under the current schedule all of it will be clean enough to transfer.

Lastly he thanked President Ezzy Ashcraft who sat on the panel for the Land Use interviews and Board member Zuppan who sat on the panel for the Economists interviews for their help. The City received over 40 responses on the Land Use RFP and narrowed it down to the 12 highest qualified whom were then interviewed. Staff will be recommending to Council on February 15, 2011 to enter into a contract with Perkins + Will a firm out of San Francisco.

They worked on the Alameda Landing Project in the past and are very knowledgeable about Alameda and some of the issues at the Naval Air Station. He reported that they had 6 interviews for an Economist and a selection has not yet been made. Also selected are ARUP, one of the leading firms on sustainable developments and Nelson/Nygaard, one of the leading firms on transportation demand management will be assisting with traffic management. He mentioned that the goal is to have a summary report on the "Going Forward" process to the community and Council in March or April and have first draft of a series of alternatives for community discussion and consideration after that and then a report for ARRA consideration and endorsement in July. He stressed that it is very important to get a project description and alternatives completed by July.

President Ezzy Ashcraft added that Thor Kaslofsky, the Project Manager for the Hunter's Point Redevelopment Project sat on the panel and it was good to hear that projects like this do eventually get going.

Mr. Thomas also reported that the City is responding to an RFP for a second campus of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) in March. The land being proposed for the LBNL is in the southern area of Alameda Point near the Maritime Administration (MARAD) Fleet.

Vice President Aurorino asked if the proposal goes through and the LBNL is built in that area is it not then deciding the use in that area.

President Ezzy Ashcraft mentioned that during the panel interviews it was mentioned that the City needs to stay flexible and if an opportunity presents itself it could be a game changer for the project.

Vice President Aurorino agrees on the need for flexibility but warns that the City is saying that they are going to use the community input to decide what is going to be built at Alameda Point and then turns around and say but this is going here. He feels that the community would welcome the addition of LBNL and the City should look for input from the community but are not necessarily going to do everything that the community wants. The

City has to work with flexibility and have a financially viable plan. He is concerned that buildings are going to be placed all over the property with no actual planned development.

Mr. Thomas stated that there is a General Plan for Alameda Point and the question is whether the City wants to change it. He stated that over the course of the community workshops the southern area was unanimously slated as a business area. He also mentioned that the leasing strategy at Alameda Point is basically short term and the City is looking at getting into some longer leases with tenants in areas where it is very unlikely that the buildings are going to be torn down.

Board member Kolhstrand stated that she is troubled that no new information is being given to the Planning Board regarding the workbook summaries. She stated that the Planning Board generally has all of the information prior to making a recommendation and without the information on how the community feels about Land Use and Building Types it is difficult to make a recommendation.

Mr. Thomas responded that he believes that the Planning Board will play a very large role in the final decision on this project and would like to hear the best way to integrate the Planning Board into the process.

Board member Ibsen asked how staff sees the process being managed.

Mr. Thomas responded that City staff will be managing the consultants and he is complying the workbook summary report with help from the consultants. He mentioned that staff will be relying on the boards and commissions to endorse the alternative plans prior to going to Council with a recommendation.

Board member Kolhstrand feels that the Planning Board doesn't have the information that the community provided and feels that information is necessary prior to making a recommendation.

Mr. Thomas stated that what the City is looking for from the boards and commissions is actually their own recommendations and thoughts and not based on the community input.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she agrees that more information would be helpful and suggested that staff come back to the Planning Board with a summary of the workbooks at the February 28, 2011 meeting.

Board member Ibsen asked if there was a scope of work established for the consultants.

Mr. Thomas stated that staff is currently working on the scope of work for the consultants and are only working on a 6 month long scope to get the project to July 2011.

President Ezzy Ashcraft opened the public comment period.

Tony Daysog spoke in favor of the process and enjoyed the Community Workshops and the energy around the project. He also mentioned that he thinks LBNL is a great opportunity as long as there are no container trucks.

Christopher Buckley, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS), referenced a letter that the AAPS send to the Planning Board stating that they strongly recommend adaptive reuse of the historic buildings at Alameda Point and listed a number of uses that would be good for those buildings. He stated that long term leases of the historical buildings would allow the tenants to make improvements to those deteriorating buildings.

Nancy Hird, Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS), spoke in favor of keeping all 62 of the historic buildings. She was disappointed that a large amount of the workbook was focused on housing and she would like to see other uses at Alameda Point.

Gretchen Lipow mentioned that there has been a high degree of community engagement in the process so far with five well attended community meetings, two held by the group "Moving Forward" and the three done by the City. Also two well attended bus tours were held by AAPS.

Karen Bey spoke in favor of the "Going Forward" process. She also believes that LBNL would be a driver for the development at Alameda Point. She is concerned that there is no revenue source other than the City to pay for this expensive process.

Jeremy Waen, Presidio Graduate School, spoke in favor of renewable energy generation at Alameda Point. He believes there are a lot of opportunities at Alameda Point.

President Ezzy Ashcraft closed the public comment period.

Vice President Aurorino stated that the development of Alameda Point is going to come at a cost. He would love it to be a recreation area but that it is not feasible, there is going to need to be housing to pay for the items the community wants out there. He stated that many people are not happy with the Harbor Bay Isle development but all of the parks, trails and other amenities were paid for by the residential development.

Board member Kolhstrand stated that she believes there is an environmental cost associated with the way Harbor Bay Isle was developed by completely separating the residential from all other uses demanding that people need to get in their cars to go

anywhere. She believes that Alameda Point should be mixed use to allow people to walk to destinations.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she is bothered by the phrase “fiscal neutrality” and should no way place a burden on the City of Alameda but she feels that the entire City will benefit from the development of Alameda Point so how could it be fiscally neutral.

Board member Kolhstrand asked Mr. Thomas what kind of feedback he is looking for from the Board.

Mr. Thomas stated that he thinks for the process to be successful the City needs input from the Planning Board.

Vice President Autorino made a motion to reopened the public comment period. Seconded by Board member Zuppan. Approved 5-0

Carol Gottstein stated that she attended two of the Community Meetings and believes that the Planning Board should receive a summary of the workbooks prior to a recommendation. She believes that all of workshops need to be pulled together (Moving Forward, AAPS and Going Forward) to get a good idea of the community responses.

President Ezzy Ashcraft closed the public comment period.

Board member Kolhstrand made the motion to continue the item to the February 28, 2011 Regular Planning Board Meeting with a summary of the workbooks and clarification of what is expected from the Board included in the staff report. Motion seconded by Board member Zuppan. Approved 5-0

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:
None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

President Ezzy Ashcraft suggested that the Planning Board go on a field trip to visit some well designed mixed use developments in the Bay Area.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 9:28 p.m.